

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 2-4 and 9-19, 22, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sato (U.S. Patent No. 6,914,691) in view of Takaoka (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,905).

Claims 5-8 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sato in view of Takaoka, and further in view of Kadowaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,038).

The Title of the Invention is objected to as not being descriptive.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants amended claims 2, 9, 12, 19, 22, and 28 to further define the invention, and amended the Title of the Invention. In addition, Applicants added new claims 29-31. Accordingly, claims 2-19, 22, and 26-31 are pending for consideration.

Objection to the Title of the Invention

The Title of the Invention is objected to as not being descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention to read “IMAGE PROCESSOR AND STORAGE MEDIUM WITH A FUNCTION FOR RECOGNITION.” Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the new Title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 and 9-19, 22, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sato (U.S. Patent No. 6,914,691) in view of Takaoka (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,905), and claims 5-8 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sato in view of Takaoka, and further in view of Kadowaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,038).

Without acquiescing to the Examiner's position that claims 2-19, 22, and 26-28 are unpatentable in view of the applied prior art, Applicants have amended independent claims 2, 19, 22, and 28 in accordance to the Examiner's suggestions on page 16 of the Office Action in order to advance prosecution. With regard to claim 9, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed language, as previously presented, recites the features suggested on page 16 of the Office Action. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claim 9 recites, in part, "... to execute recognition processing for the input image data at a *lower resolution* than an output resolution ... at a higher resolution if a *possibility* of including the specific image in the input image data is higher than a *predetermined level*," (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 2, 19, 22, and 28, as amended, as well as independent claim 9 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claims 2, 9, 19, 22, and 28 and dependent claims 3-8, 10-18, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn.

New Claims 29-31

Applicants have added new claims 29-31 to further define the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 29-31 are allowable at least because of the combination of features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy

Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: July 12, 2007

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20004

Tel.: 202.739.3000

Fax: 202.739.3001